

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 9 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above identified patent application is hereby requested. Claims 1-9, 11-29, 31-33, and 35-38 are now in the application with claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32 being independent. Claims 11, 21, 24, 31, and 32 have been amended. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-9, 11-29, 31-33, and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,225 to Rangarajan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,326 to Atkin et al. Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rangarajan et al. in view of Atkin et al., and in further view of Sanna, et al. *Using Windows NT Workstation 4.0*, 1997. These contentions are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1:

The Applicant's claim 1 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) "executing the logic included in the function description to select an appearance description of a first appearance to be presented by the user interface; associating the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time into an executable form; and executing the executable form of the user interface to generate the user interface with the associated function description and appearance description."

The Office (Action of May 22, 2006, page 3) asserts that "...the mere fact that the functionality and the appearance of the GUIs are both established at the same time does not imply that there are no separate function and appearance descriptions." The Office (*Id.*) further asserts that the modify procedure of Rangarajan allows the functionality and appearance of a GUI to be separately modified. The Office, however, has not met its burden to show that Rangarajan discloses, teaches, or suggests the existence of a function description separate from an appearance description.

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 10 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

Rangarajan (Abstract) indicates that (underlining added for emphasis) "The invention engages in a dialog with the user to determine which GUI features are desired by the user. Depending on the user's answers a model representation of the GUI (a configuration) is saved." This indicates that the customized GUI is represented using a single configuration (or representation). Rangarajan (Col. 5, lines 14-46) also discloses that at least one configuration, such as a default configuration, is generated, saved, and loaded for use. A single configuration can then be used to present a customized GUI to the user. Further, Rangarajan (Col. 9, lines 41-47 and Col. 8, lines 57-65) discloses that each configuration is associated with one corresponding data structure. As such, Rangarajan explains that a GUI is constructed according to a single configuration, which in turn is defined by one data structure. Thus, Rangarajan does not disclose, teach, or suggest defining a customized GUI using separate function and appearance descriptions. Therefore, Rangarajan also does not disclose, teach, or suggest executing the logic included in a function description to select an appearance description of a first appearance to be presented by the user interface, as is claimed. Further, Atkin (Col. 4, lines 2-26 and Col. 6, lines 20-26) discloses that a user can change the cultural profile of a program by dragging and dropping a locale change object onto an application to initiate the locale change daemon. Therefore, Atkin does not disclose, teach, or suggest a function description including logic for selecting an appearance of the user interface based on a geographic location of a user of the computer program on the fly at run time.

As discussed above, Rangarajan (Col. 9, lines 41-47 and Col. 8, lines 57-65) discloses that a single data structure corresponds to a configuration. Thus, use of separate function and appearance descriptions to define an interface is not contemplated by Rangarajan. Further, Rangarajan (Col. 5, lines 39-46) indicates that a single configuration is used to create the user-configured GUI that is presented to the user. Therefore, Rangarajan also does not disclose, teach, or suggest associating a function description and an appearance description on the fly at run time into an executable form and executing the executable form of the user interface to generate the user interface with the associated function description and appearance description, as is claimed.

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 11 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

Additionally, the modify procedure disclosed by Rangarajan does not allow separate modification of the functionality and appearance of a GUI. Rangarajan (Col. 8, lines 57-65 and Col. 9, lines 41-47) indicates that the modify procedure is invoked for an entire configuration, not a portion of a configuration. Further, (*Id.*) the configuration is revised by beginning at the terminal node of the data structure that generated the configuration and having the user revisit and modify responses to one or more of the interrogatories associated with that configuration. As such, Rangarajan discloses that the entire configuration is subjected to the modify procedure, regardless of how much of the data structure actually is changed.

Therefore, Rangarajan, taken alone or in combination with Atkin, does not disclose, teach, or suggest the existence of separate function descriptions and appearance descriptions, or associating the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time, as is claimed. For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over Rangarajan in view of Atkin. As claims 2-9, 37, and 38 depend from claim 1, these dependent claims also are allowable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3:

The Applicant's claim 2 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) "replacing the function description during program execution while providing a continuity of presentation." Similarly, the Applicant's claim 3 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) "replacing the appearance description during program execution to present logic of the user interface with a different appearance."

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Rangarajan does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of separate function descriptions and appearance descriptions. Although Rangarajan (Col. 8, lines 57-65) indicates that a modify procedure can be invoked to modify the selected configuration, Rangarajan (Col. 8, lines 13-15) also discloses that a configuration can be modified only through use of the Profile Manager process. Further, Rangarajan (Col. 8, lines 57-65) indicates that, through the Profile Manager process, the user must activate the "modify entry"

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 12 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

selectable control area and manually modify responses to one or more previous interrogatories in order to modify the configuration.

Additionally, after a configuration is modified through the modify procedure, Rangarajan (*Id.*) discloses that "the profile manager process 700 continues to the 'user invoked event' procedure 709 for subsequent user invoked events." As such, the GUI associated with the modified configuration is not displayed to the user. Therefore, Rangarajan does not disclose, teach, or suggest "replacing a function description during program execution while providing a continuity of presentation" or "replacing the appearance description during program execution to present logic of the user interface with a different appearance", as is claimed. For at least these reasons, claims 2 and 3 also are allowable over Rangarajan in view of Atkin based on their own merits.

Claim 11:

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Rangarajan does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of separate function descriptions and appearance descriptions. Thus, Rangarajan also does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of separate map components and fashion components. The Applicant's claim 11 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) "associating the map component and the fashion component to generate the user interface, the map component including logic for changing one of the map component and the fashion component, the map component including instructions for handling and processing interface objects and events."

Rangarajan (Col. 8, lines 13-65) indicates that a configuration can be modified, but discloses that the configuration can be modified only through use of the modify procedure associated with the profile manager process. Rangarajan does not indicate that any component used to generate a GUI, including a configuration and the data structure corresponding to a configuration, includes logic for changing a map component or a fashion component. Rather, Rangarajan (Col. 8, lines 57-65) teaches that a configuration and the corresponding data structure merely record responses to interrogatories. Therefore, Rangarajan does not disclose, teach, or

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 13 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

suggest a map component that includes logic for changing one of the map component and the fashion component.

As amended the Applicant's claim 11 also calls for "selecting a map component and a fashion component, wherein at least one of the map component and the fashion component are selected automatically according to a geographic location of a user of the computer program on the fly at run time."

Atkin (Abstract and Col. 4, lines 2-26) discloses that a user can modify the cultural profile of a program by dragging and dropping a locale object on a window associated with the program. Thus, Atkin teaches that the cultural profile of a program can be changed at the request of a user to match the locale object selected by the user. Atkin does not disclose, teach, or suggest, however, that at least one of a map component and a fashion component are selected according to a geographic location of a user. In fact, Atkin (Col. 6, lines 35-38) states that "...a user can work with a spreadsheet using an Arabic toolbar, commands, etc., while the spreadsheet actually contains Japanese currency." Therefore, Atkin discloses that one or more cultural profiles can be specified by a user, not that a map component or a fashion component are selected according to a geographic location of a user.

Further, Atkin (Col. 6, lines 20-26) discloses that the locale change daemon is suspended until activated by a user click and that a user must drag-and-drop a locale change object onto an application to initiate a change. Therefore, Atkin also does not disclose that at least one of the map component and the fashion component are selected automatically according to a geographic location of a user of the computer program on the fly at run time. For at least these reasons, independent claim 11 is allowable over Rangarajan in view of Atkin. As claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, these dependent claims also are allowable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 11.

Claim 21:

The Applicant's claim 21 includes elements similar to those set forth in claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 21 is allowable over Rangarajan in view of Atkin for at least the

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 14 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

reasons expressed with respect to claim 1. As claims 22-29 depend from claim 21, these dependent claims also are allowable based on claim 21.

Claim 31:

The Applicant's claim 31 includes elements similar to those set forth in claim 11. Therefore, independent claim 31 is allowable over Rangarajan in view of Atkin for at least the reasons expressed with respect to claim 11.

Claim 32:

The Applicant's claim 32 includes elements similar to those set forth in claims 11 and 31. Therefore, independent claim 32 is allowable over Rangarajan in view of Atkin for at least the reasons expressed with respect to claims 11 and 31.

The Applicant's claim 32 further calls for "means for changing the fashion component to present logic of the user interface with a different appearance during program execution." As indicated by the Office (Action of May 22, 2006, page 6), this element is similar to claim 3, discussed above. Therefore, independent claim 32 also is allowable over Rangarajan in view of Atkin for at least the reasons expressed with respect to claim 3. As claims 33, 35, and 36 depend from claim 32, these dependent claims also are allowable based on claim 32.

Claim 35:

The Applicant's claim 32 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) "a device coupled to the processor to present the user interface." Further, the Applicant's claim 35, which depends from claim 32, states (underlining added for emphasis) "wherein the device is a telephone." Therefore, claim 35 calls for the device – the telephone – to present the user interface. The Office acknowledges (Action of May 22, 2006, page 8) that the combination of Rangarajan and Atkin fails to explicitly teach that the device is a telephone, but asserts that Sanna teaches (underlining added for emphasis) "that a telephone connects to a PC system and utilizes the PC monitor to present a user interface associated with the telephone." Even under this

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 15 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

interpretation, Sanna does not disclose, teach, or suggest that a telephone coupled to the processor presents the user interface.

Sanna (p. 442, ¶6) indicates that Windows NT 4.0 includes a Phone Dialer application that can be used to dial a telephone connected to the host computer. Further, as identified by the Office, Sanna (pp. 442-444) states that the Phone Dialer application includes an interface displayed on a monitor that can be used to dial the telephone or to store telephone numbers in a speed-dial. Sanna does not, however, disclose, teach, or suggest that the telephone coupled to the processor presents the user interface, as is claimed. Rather, Sanna teaches that the Phone Dialer application, which is displayed to the user via a visual display, allows a user to dial an associated telephone. Moreover, there is no motivation to combine the cited references because Sanna discloses only the use of a display for presenting a user interface, which is also disclosed in Rangarajan. For at least these reasons, claim 35 also is allowable on its own merits over Rangarajan in view of Atkin, and further in view of Sanna.

Concluding Comments

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Office, the applicant does not acquiesce to other positions taken by the Office that have not been explicitly traversed. Additionally, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim presented in this response should not be understood to indicate that no further reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account number 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 21, 2006


William E. Hunter
Reg. No. 47,671

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 21876
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10636185.doc